

v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 390 F.3d 812, 818 (4th Cir. 2004). In determining whether a pre-filing injunction is substantively warranted, a court must weigh the following: (1) the party's history of litigation, in particular whether he has filed vexatious, harassing, or duplicative lawsuits; (2) whether the party had a good faith basis for pursuing the litigation, or simply intended to harass; (3) the extent of the burden on the courts and other parties resulting from the party's filings; and (4) the adequacy of other sanctions. Id.

Judge Mullen has already found that Ms. Boston has a history of vexatious and bad-faith litigation. Additionally, the burden she is creating for the Court weighs in favor of extending the injunction. When a plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court must review her complaint to determine whether it is subject to dismissal on the grounds that it is "frivolous or malicious [or] fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). In its frivolity review, this Court must determine whether the complaint raises an indisputably meritless legal theory or is founded upon clearly baseless factual contentions, such as fantastic or delusional scenarios. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989). While this process requires an expenditure of court resources, it must be done since the monetary deterrent against frivolous claims is non-existent when the plaintiff proceeds essentially for free.

Ms. Boston has appeared as a party in at least seventeen cases in the Western District since 2012. In all but one of these cases, Ms. Boston has moved to proceed *in forma pauperis*. This type of repetitive filing has served to hinder the judicial economy and efficiency of the court. The narrow injunction issued by Judge Mullen has not altered Ms. Boston's conduct. She continues to bring lawsuits under different statutes and demands a rapid response from the Court in deciding her motions. In order to prevent the waste of judicial time and resources stemming from overly litigious plaintiffs such as Ms. Boston, the Court hereby EXTENDS the pre-filing

injunction to all cases in which Ms. Boston seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Ms. Boston must seek the Court's permission before filing any type of IFP case in the Western District.

For the reasons stated above Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: October 15, 2014

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Frank D. Whitney", written over a horizontal line.

Frank D. Whitney
Chief United States District Judge

